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It is widely recognized that strikingly archaic linguistic features are preserved in Hittite\(^1\). Retention of archaism is most remarkable in phonology, where the discovery of laryngeals opened a way to the solution of many problems. The significance of Hittite for the study of Indo-European morphology seems less dramatic and in fact there still remain many issues which reject a consensus among scholars. One grammatical category in Hittite where no objection is raised to its antiquity is mediopassive verbs. The primary mediopassive endings from selected ancient IE languages are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Vedic</th>
<th>Greek (Arc.-Cyp.)</th>
<th>Old Irish</th>
<th>Hittite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg. 1</td>
<td>*-(h)_(2)er</td>
<td>-(e)</td>
<td>-(\mu)((\alpha))</td>
<td>-(ur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*-(th)_(2)er</td>
<td>-se</td>
<td>-(\sigma)((\alpha))</td>
<td>-(\text{ther})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*-(or), *-(tor)</td>
<td>-(e), -(te)</td>
<td>-(\tau)((\text{ir}))</td>
<td>-(\text{ir}(\text{passive }-\text{air}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In extra-Hittite languages represented by Vedic, Greek and Old Irish the original mediopassive endings per se were more or less remade under the influence of the corresponding athematic active endings, 1 sg. *-\(mi\), 2 sg. *-\(si\) and 3 sg. *-\(ti\). On the other hand, Hittite preserves essential features of the original mediopassive endings, *-\(h\)_\(2\)er, *-\(th\)_\(2\)er, *-\(or\) and *-\(tor\).

In the 3 sg., two endings, *-\(o\) and *-\(to\), are generally reconstructed. The ending *-\(o\) is more archaic than *-\(to\). In the majority of daughter languages the innovative *-\(to\) spread to a large extent. However, unmistakable traces of *-\(o\) are found in Anatolian, Indic and Old Irish as observed in the above table. In Hittite a significant number of mediopassives still belong to the \(a\)-class as represented by \(e\)(\(\text{s}\)) “sits”, \(k\)(\(\text{i}\))(\(\text{s}\)) “becomes”, etc. Vedic also has a significant number of 3 sg. mediopassives in -\(e\) which is a descendant of PIE *-\(o\) plus deictic particle *-\(i\). The original ending *-\(o\) is probably also retained in Old Irish passives in absolute -\(air\) and conjunct -\(ar\).

A number of scholars suggested a ‘stative’ category for the archaic ending *-\(o\), which, according to them, shows a functional difference from the non-stative ending *-\(to\). This suggestion is not very easy to accept because many Hittite \(a\)-class mediopassive verbs such as \(\text{h}\)(\(\text{att}\)) “strikes”, \(\text{p}\)(\(\text{ar}\))(\(\text{s}\))(\(\text{i}\)) “breaks” and \(\text{h}\)(\(\text{z}\))(\(\text{i}\))(\(\text{a}\)) “calls” are unambiguously telic, and not stative in any ordinary sense of the term.

The two endings, *-\(o\) and *-\(to\), are generally assumed to have existed at the Proto-Indo-European stage. For example, Watkins (1969: 84) states that “Das Heth. Material … zeigt, daß beide Endungen (= -\(a\) and -\(\text{ta}\) [KY]) von der gemeinsamen Ursprache ererb sein müssen; die Verdrängung von *-\(o\) (heth. -\(a\)) durch *-\(to\) (heth. -\(\text{ta}\)) war nur eine teilweise

---

\(^1\) This paper was orally presented at the 6th International Congress of Hittitology. Because of the limited time available for oral presentation I could not show full evidence for my claim. Readers interested in more details should refer to another paper of mine that will appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.

\(^2\) This position is most explicit in Oettinger (1976, 1993), Rix (1977), Kortlandt (1979), Kümmel (1996) and Goto (1997), among others.
and die älteren und jüngeren Formen bestanden nebeneinander innerhalb des gleichen Systems sowohl vor wie nach der Trennung der idg. Einzelsprachen weiter. The view that the morphological change from *-o to *-to goes back to Proto-Indo-European seems perfectly straightforward at first glance because the innovative *-to is observed everywhere in the daughter languages. However, there are pieces of evidence in Hittite that throw doubt on this view as far as the primary, that is, non-derived mediopassives are concerned.

Watkins (1969: 85f.) pointed out two types of morphological changes that occurred to the basic 3 sg. mediopassive ending -a in Hittite. One is the replacement -a to -ta, that is, PIE *-o to *-to and the other is -a to -atta. The second renewal is additive: the original ending -a came to be doubly characterized by the addition of the newly created -ta. As is correctly pointed by Watkins, it is important to note that the second morphological change presupposes the prior existence of the first morphological change, i.e., -a to -ta. The following three examples are adduced by Watkins as illustrating the substitution of -ta for -a.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{kîja} (\text{*kê-ö}) & \rightarrow \text{kitta(ri)} (\text{*kê-to}) \quad \text{"lies"} \\
\text{eśa, eśari "sits"} & \rightarrow \text{eśari} \\
\text{tuḫša, tuḫš[a]ri} (\text{OH}) \quad \text{"cuts off"} & \rightarrow \text{tuḫḫuša} (\text{OH+})
\end{align*}\]

However, the first two examples should be interpreted differently. kîja should be taken as a pronoun kî plus an enclitic particle -ja\(^3\) and eśari is used as the 2 sg., not as the 3 sg. The third example is a good case for the pattern of the replacement. Note that t-less tuḫša and tuḫš[a]ri are attested in Old Hittite original manuscripts, whereas tuḫḫuša with -ta is attested in a Middle Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text.

The examples that Watkins cites as the second morphological change, -a to -atta, are shown below.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ḫuittija(ti)} (\text{OH, Anitta}) \quad \text{"pulled"} & \rightarrow \text{ḫuittijatta(t)} (\text{NH, Hattušiliš III}) \\
\text{ḫaliţa, ḥaliţari} (\text{OH++}) \quad \text{"kneels down"} & \rightarrow \text{ḥaliţattat} (\text{NH}) \\
\text{laḫušarî} (\text{OH++}) \quad \text{"pours"} & \rightarrow \text{la-ḫu-ya-ta-ri} \quad \text{KUB XIII 8, 8 (jh)}\(^4\) \\
\text{ḫalzija} (\text{OH}) \quad \text{"calls"} & \rightarrow \text{ḫalzijatari} (\text{OH++})
\end{align*}\]

In the first example, a t-less ḥuittija(ti) attested in an Old Hittite original manuscript of

\(^3\) It is to be noted that the transformation *kê-ö → *kê-to is in fact observed in Lycian sijeni and siteni.

\(^4\) A note should be given to la-ḫu-ya-ta-ri right to the arrow. According to the on-line concordance of Hittite texts maintained by Silvin Košak in Mainz, the manuscript which includes this form is Neo-Hittite abbreviated as jh. This on-line concordance is very useful in many respects, but it gives us information only on dates of manuscripts (ah, mh, jh), not on dates of texts. In this paper dates of texts are also given when possible. In any event the third sign of this form looks very strange. It looks like ya, but it seems to have two horizontals in a right part of the sign. Friedrich (1991:125) transcribes this form as laḫušatari with a question mark. Puhvel (2001:18) argues that it is la-ḫu-ut-ta-ri, not la-ḫu-ya-ta-ri without any further comments. Güterbock and Hoffner (1980:13) read it la-ḫu-ur'-ta-ri with a question mark on ur. In my judgment la-ḫu-ut-ta-ri would be more likely because this reading is consistent with its corresponding preterite laḫuṭtat and also la-a-ḫu-ut-ta-ri (2x, NH) cited from an unpublished tablet (829/z) by Puhvel. If it is la-ḫu-ut-ta-ri, it will turn out that this example reflects the morphological change -a to -ta, not -a to -atta.
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Anitta text is replaced by ḫuittijattat with -ta, which is attested in a Neo-Hittite historical text of Ḥattušiliš III. The other three examples show the same pattern. In addition to the above examples there are many more examples showing these two types of morphological changes. The following list includes additional examples of -a to -ta.

\[ \begin{align*} ṣuṽp[a]ji[a]ṭati & \text{ (OH) "cleaned" } \rightarrow \text{ ṣuṽp[a]ji[a]ṭari (mh)} \\ p[a]ṭi & \text{ (MH) "protects" } \rightarrow \text{ p[a]ṭašat (NH)} \\ ṣiṽun[a]ji[a]ṭati & \text{ (OH) "was smitten (with disease)" } \rightarrow \text{ ṣiṽun[a]jaṭa (OH++)} \\ ṣuṽp[a]rari & \text{ (date?) "sleeps" } \rightarrow \text{ ṣu-[up]-ta'-ri (sjh)} \\ karṣa & \text{ (jh) "cuts" } \rightarrow \text{ karašari (OH++)} \\ ṣaṭṭārī & \text{ (jh) "is favorable" } \rightarrow \text{ ṣaṭ[ta] (jh)} \end{align*} \]

In the first example ṣuṽp[a]ji[a]ṭati with -a in an Old Hittite original manuscript was replaced by ṣuṽp[a]ji[a]ṭari with -ta in Middle Hittite manuscript. Likewise, in the second example p[a]ṭi with -a in a Middle Hittite was transformed to p[a]ṭašat with -ta in a Neo-Hittite historical text. In the third example ṣiṽun[a]ji[a]ṭati with -a in a Middle Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text contrasts with ṣiṽun[a]jaṭa with -ta in a Neo-Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text. In the fourth example, ṣuṽp[a]rari, the date of which cannot be determined, has -a in contrast to ṣu-[up]-ta'-ri, where ša sign is actually used in place of ta sign. It must be a scribal error because ša sign and ta sign are very similar. This ṣu-[up]-ta'-ri is recorded in a late Neo-Hittite manuscript according to the website by Silvin Košak. As for the pairs karṣa vs. karašari and ṣaṭṭārī with Glossenkeil vs. ṣaṭ[ta], all the examples are attested in Neo-Hittite manuscripts. But the examples with -ta must be secondary.

Additional examples that illustrate the morphological change, -a to -atta, are shown below.

\[ \begin{align*} iṽkallārī & \text{ (OH) "tears up" } \rightarrow \text{ iṽkallatta (MH+)} \\ ḫännari & \text{ (OH++, MH) "decides", ḫannat (OH+) } \rightarrow \text{ ḫannat (date?)} \\ nēari & \text{ (OH++) "turns", nēat (MH), nēja (MH), neja (OH++, MH+)} \rightarrow \text{ nejaṭat (OH++), etc.} \\ LUGAL-izziat (NH) & \text{ "reigned as a king" } \rightarrow \text{ LUGAL-izzi[j]at (jh)} \end{align*} \]

In the first example iṽkallārī with -a attested in a Middle Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text is replaced by iṽkallatta with -atta in a Neo-Hittite copy of a Middle Hittite text. The same -a to -atta transformation is also observed in the remaining three examples. Although the date of ḫannat cannot be determined, it must be a late form because of its final apocopated -t, not -ti.

There are ambiguous examples, too. The following examples cannot be easily classified as illustrating either -a to -ta or -a to -atta transformation:

\[ \begin{align*} a[r]g[a] & \text{ (MH+) "mounts" } \rightarrow \text{ arkatta (OH+)} \\ ḫînga & \text{ (OH) "bows" } \rightarrow \text{ ḫinkatta (OH++)} \\ parś[a] & \text{ (OH) "breaks" } \rightarrow \text{ parśattari (MH+)} \end{align*} \]

5 The following examples are mainly from Neu (1968) and Yoshida (1990).

6 Besides LUGAL-izzi[j]at (jh) there is LUGAL-uizzittat (MH+), which is probably a syncopated form from the former.
As for the first two examples, a[rǥ]a vs. arkatta and hïnga vs. hïnkatta, there is no way to judge whether a before the ending -tta is real or orthographic because in both cases the verb stems end in consonant clusters. They will turn out to be examples of the transformation -a to -atta if a before -tta is real, but examples of -a to -tta if it is orthographic. The third example paršittari is puzzling. paršjä must be a derived thematic present in *-jelo-, which in general shows only the ending -(a)ri, not -(a)ri. Contrary to this predilection, the extended form is paršjärri, not paršjattari. The actually attested form with t is the hapax paršittari, which was probably produced from expected but unattested paršjattari by syncope. The fourth example šijettari is irregular in having e, not a, before the ending. It is probably due to the corresponding active šezzi. The fifth example lagätittari is also unique in having āi before the ending. This contaminated form must have been created by attaching the mediopassive ending -tari to 3 sg. hi-verb **lākai, which is unattested but theoretically expected from lākī in a parallel way that mallai “grinds” is secondarily created from malli; cf. Jasanoff (2003: 65).

As I have demonstrated above, there are a large number of examples that illustrate the transformations, -a to -ta and -a to -atta. These examples clearly show that these two morphological changes were still operating in the historical period of Hittite.

Next let us take a closer look at examples with -atta. We have already seen above that mediopassives with -atta are late forms remodeled from their original forms with -a. In fact there was so far no example with -atta attested in an Old Hittite original manuscript.

How about other mediopassives marked by -atta from the very beginning of their attestation?

ḥarrā- “crush”: ḥarrattari (MH, jh), pret. ḥarratta (mh) (< *h₂érh₃-o-; cf. Melchert 1994: 79)
šarrā- “break”: šarratta (jh), šarrattat (mh) (< *serh₃-o-)
tarrā- “be able, can”: pres. tarratta (OH+, mh), tarrattat (NH) (< *térh₂-o-; cf. Melchert 1994: 79)
zinnā- “end, finish”: zinnattari (OH++), zinnat[t]at (jh) (< *si-n-h₁-o-; cf. Melchert 1994: 80)
šannā- “conceal”: šannatta (MH+) (< *senh₂-o-)
arrā- “wash oneself”: pret. arrattat (jh) (< *h₁erH-o-; cf. Jasanoff 2003: 78)
ep- “seize”: eppattat (jh); cf. epzi
pippa- “turn over”: pippattari (OH++) (< *pꜜp-PH-or; cf. Jasanoff 2003: 131)
yeḥ- “turn”: yeḥatta (OH++, MH+), yeḥattat (OH++, MH+) (cf. yeḥiari OH+)
šuway- “fill”: šuwayatti (MH+), šuwayattat (jh) (cf. šuttati jh)
tahšš “be allotted, be designated”: tahššattari (jh)

7 This analysis is due to a suggestion from Craig Melchert (personal communication). As we saw above, syncope is also observed in LUGAL-uzzittat which must have been created from LUGAL-izzijattat.
It is interesting that the first six examples of the above list show a stem final laryngeal preceded by a sonorant, which regularly becomes geminated sonorants between vowels. They are ḫarrattari, šarratta, tarratta, zinnattari, šannatta and arrattat. The seventh example parḫattari must have been secondarily created under the influence of the corresponding active 3 sg. parazī and parḫaṭi. Parḫattari probably replaced phonologically regular *parrattari. As for the following ḫuṭṭatta, a before the ending -ta must be real because j is actually written. The same is probably true of eppattat and pippattari. They could be spelled *eptat and *piptat, respectively, but there are no such examples. As for ṣeṭatta and šuṭattari, they must have been remodeled from ṣeṭṭari and šuttati, respectively. In the case of the last example taḫšattari, however, there is no way to tell whether a before the ending -ta is real or not because this verb has a stem final consonant cluster. It is important to note that none of these examples with -atta are again recorded in Old Hittite original manuscripts.

Among ta-class mediopassives with -ta there are five verbs which superficially seem to have an atta-ending.

ት hưለ “combat”: ḫullattti (OH++), ḫullatttt (sjih) < *h₂*lše-ne-h₁ (cf. Melchert 1994: 55)

luk(k)- “dawn, get light”: lukkatta < *-ėje/o- (cf. Melchert 1984: 16)

tarna- “let, leave”: tarnattari < *ṭ (K)neh₂ (cf. Melchert 1994: 167)

duṣyarnai- “break, tear to pieces”: duṣyarnatti < *duyenne-ėje/o- (cf. Melchert 1984: 36)

ijā- “march”: ijatta, but iēṭta (OH) < *h₁̄j̄-ė-to or *h₁ej-too.

From the first four stems are created mediopassives ḫul(l)attat(i), lukkatta, tarnattari and duṣyarnattari, all of which seem to be characterized by -atta. But a before the ending -ta is a part of the stem, and therefore they belong to the ta-class, not the atta-class. The prevalent form of the fifth stem ija- is ijatta, but ijatta is late. Old Hittite has iēṭta, which Melchert (1984: 19) derived from a thematized *hJ}-e-to following Watkins (1969: 199). It would also be possible to derive it from the preform *h₁eje-to with initial yod analogically transferred from 3 pl. iēnta.

We have already seen a considerable number of examples which underwent the morphological changes, -a to -ta or -a to -atta in the internal Hittite history. It is, however, very doubtful that they completely shifted to ta- or atta-class from the original a-class in later Hittite. A great majority of the examples preserve their old character as a-class in their imperative forms, as is illustrated in the following examples.8

eṣa, eṣari → eṣat, but imper. eṣaru

tuḥša, tuḥš[a]ri → tuḥšuṣa, but imper. tuḥšaru

laḥṣuṣari → laḥṣuttari, but imper. laḥṣuṣaru

yaššari → yaštari, but imper. yaššaru

paḥšari → paḥšaṭat, but imper. paḥšaru

ḥannari, ḫannat → ḫannattat, but imper. ḫannar[lu]

nēari, nēat, nēja, nejat → neattat, nejattat, but imper. nejaru

a[r]ja → arkatta, but imper. argaru

lagarī → lagāttari, but imper. lagaru

karṣa → karṣātari, but imper. karṣṣaru, karṣṭaru

8 Needless to say, the list excludes the cases where imperative forms are not recorded.
paršja → paršittari, but imper. paršttaru, paršjaddaru

Although remodeling occurred in 3 sg. indicative forms, their corresponding 3 sg. imperatives are still a-class but for the last two examples. Interesting enough, two ta-class mediopassive verbs, ḫap- “join” (3 sg. ḫapdari, ḫaptai) and au(š)- “see” (3 sg. uyayittari, uyayattai, auštat), have only a-class imperatives ḫapparu and uyaru, respectively.

Of enormous importance in determining the date when *-o was replaced by *-to are the examples as follows9.

pres. pahšari vs. pret. paḫḫat (cf. imper. pahšaru)
pres. eša(ri) vs. pret. ešati, ešadi, ešat → ešat, ešsat, eššat (sic!) (cf. imper. ešaru)
pres. tuḫšari → tuḫḫuša vs. pret. tuḫḫušat, tuḫḫušat (cf. imper. tuḫšaru)
pres. laḫušari → laḫuttari (or laḫuḫatari?) vs. pret. laḫuttat (cf. imper. laḫḫarū)

In the first example the present form pahšari retains original -a, whereas the preterite paḫḫat is remodeled to ta-class. In the second example the present form is exclusively eša or ešati with original -a, but the preterite has ešat or eššat with remodeling as well as older ešati, ešadi and ešat. In the third example the preterite forms are consistently characterized by -ta. Because tuḫḫušati has the unapocopated particle -ti which is characteristic of Old Hittite, the replacement of -ta for -a in the preterite must have been earlier than the same replacement in the present, where both tuḫšari with -a and tuḫḫuša with -ta are attested. The fourth example has original a-class laḫušari as well as innovative laḫuttari in the present, but the preterite has only laḫuttat with -ta.

Also crucial are the following examples, which show the pattern of present in -a(ri) vs. preterite in -attat.

pres. ḫannari vs. pret. ḫannat ~ ḫannatat (cf. imper. ḫannar[u])
pres. neja(ri), neāari vs. pret. nejat → nejattat, neattat (cf. imper. nejaru, nejāru)
pres. ḫuittijari vs. pret. ḫuittijati ~ ḫuittijattat (cf. imper. ḫuittijaru)
pres. ḫali(ja)(ri) vs. pret. ḫali(jat)att
pres. iškallāri vs. pret. iškallatta

All the examples of the present preserve original -a, as illustrated by ḫannari, neja(ri), neāari, ḫuittijari, ḫali(ja)(ri) and iškallāri. In the preterite, on the other hand, there are remodeled forms with -atta such as ḫannatat, nejattat, neattat, ḫuittijattat, ḫali(jat)att and iškallatta.

Let us summarize our results obtained from the survey of Hittite internal facts. i) Two morphological changes, -a → -ta and -a → -atta were still in progress in the historical period of Hittite. ii) Mediopassives with -atta are characteristic of later Hittite. None of the examples are attested in Old Hittite original manuscripts. iii) A great majority of remodeled mediopassives with -ta and -atta still preserve their original a-class status in imperative forms. Furthermore, there are some cases where even ta-class mediopassives have imperatives in -aru. iv) There are many pairs which show the patterns, pres. in -a(ri) vs. pret. in -tat(i) and pres. in -a(ri) vs. pret. in -attat.

---

9 The forms with -ta and -atta in the following lists are marked in bold face for the convenience of clarity.
These findings are now open to historical interpretation. At the outset of this paper I showed the paradigm of the mediopassive endings reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, where both *-0 and *-to are included as the 3 sg. endings. At this point we may wonder when Proto-Indo-European was spoken. Watkins (1998: 26) refers it to “seven thousand years ago”, that is, 5000 BC. As we saw above, the morphological changes -a → -ta was still operating in the Hittite historical period. The reconstruction of *-to for Proto-Indo-European would inevitably lead us to assume that the speed of this morphological change was exceptionally slow. It would turn out that the change was in progress for more than 3,500 years. Because such a situation is simply unconceivable, the ending *-to cannot have been created at the Proto-Indo-European stage. This view is supported by two facts presented above. The ending -atta, which is addition of -ta to the original -a, presupposes the prior existence of -ta. The complete lack of -atta in Old Hittite original manuscripts shows that the creation of -ta does not go back to a very early period. The preservation of original *-a in the imperative will be a further confirmation of this view.10

If I am on the right track in assuming that neither *-to nor *-oto does not go back to the common period, the next question to be asked is whether there are any clues to determining when the morphological changes *-o → *-to and *-o → *-oto occurred. In this respect our finding that -ta is overwhelmingly favored in the preterite plays a decisive role. An implication of this distributional imbalance is not very hard to understand. If the morphological influence from the primary active 3 sg. *-ti and that from the secondary active 3 sg. *-t were the same, the degree to which *-o was replaced by *-to would be no different between the present and the preterite. This is probably the case that happened in non-Anatolian languages like Greek as illustrated below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{primary active 3 sg.} & \quad *-ti \\
\downarrow \\
\text{primary mediopassive 3 sg.} & \quad *-or \rightarrow *-tor \\
& \quad \text{e.g. Gk. ἔργος 'lies' (< *-to-i)} \\
\text{secondary active 3 sg.} & \quad *-t \\
\downarrow \\
\text{secondary mediopassive 3 sg.} & \quad *-o \rightarrow *-to \\
& \quad \text{e.g. Gk. ἔργα 'lay' (< *-to)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In Hittite, on the other hand, the present active 3 sg. *-ti became *-tsi by an affrication rule that occurred in its prehistory.11 The *-tsi created by assibilation did not put any morphological pressure on the corresponding present mediopassive ending as illustrated below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pres. active 3 sg.} & \quad *-tsi < *-ti \\
\downarrow \\
\text{pres. mediopassive 3 sg.} & \quad *-a \rightarrow *-tsa \\
\text{pret. active 3 sg.} & \quad *-t \\
\downarrow \\
\text{pret. mediopassive 3 sg.} & \quad *-a \rightarrow *-ta \\
\end{align*}
\]

---


11 I argued in Yoshida (1998) that affrication also occurred to lenited *-di, but I will not consider this case here so as not to make our discussion unnecessarily complicated.
But the preterite active 3 sg. *-t, which did not undergo the affrication, did have morphological influence on the corresponding preterite mediopassive ending. In fact, Hittite favored unlenited *t rather than lenited *d in this morphological change. The *-ta thus first created in the preterite 3 sg. later gradually replaced *-a in the corresponding present 3 sg. This reconstructed prehistory would probably best account for the preponderance of -ta over -a in the Hittite preterite mediopassive. During later attested history of Hittite -ta also came to be attached to the original -a first in the preterite (pret. mediopassive 3 sg. -a(ti) → -a-tta(ti)) and then in the present (pres. mediopassive 3 sg. -a(ri) → -a-tta(ri)).

The results of our findings and analyses in this paper are summarized below. The morphological changes, -a → -ta and -a → -atta, are still operating during attested Hittite history. This fact, together with the nonexistence of -atta in Old Hittite and the original a-class status in imperatives, shows that 3 sg. mediopassive verbs in *-to had not been created at the Proto-Indo-European stage. The fact that -ta is overwhelmingly favored by preterite mediopassives in Hittite leads us to assume that many ta-class mediopassives were created after the affrication. The morphological history of Hittite mediopassive verbs clarified in this paper shows that another archaic linguistic feature which the other branches lost is still retained in Hittite.
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